

Retrospective Theses and Dissertations

1980

Perception of Subordinates' Job Evaluation Factors to Determine Supervisor-subordinate Agreement

George Edward Romot
University of Central Florida

 Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#)
Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/rtd>
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Masters Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Romot, George Edward, "Perception of Subordinates' Job Evaluation Factors to Determine Supervisor-subordinate Agreement" (1980). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 511.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/rtd/511>

PERCEPTION OF SUBORDINATES' JOB
EVALUATION FACTORS TO DETERMINE
SUPERVISOR-SUBORDINATE AGREEMENT

BY

GEORGE EDWARD ROMOT
B.A., University of Central Florida, 1975

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science: Industrial Psychology
in the Graduate Studies Program of the College of Social
Sciences at the University of Central Florida
at Orlando, Florida

Winter Quarter

1980

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Method	9
Result	12
Discussion	18
Appendix 1 - Job Factors and Rating Scale	25
Appendix 2 - Purpose and Instructions . .	27
Reference Notes	31
References	32

Supervisor and subordinate viewpoints on what constitutes the subordinate's job has been a subject of investigation for the past two decades. Although research data are sparse, it is not uncommon to find that supervisors and their subordinates tend to disagree on what constitutes the subordinate's job. In one study conducted by Maier, 1961, detailed interviews of both supervisors and their subordinates regarding the subordinate's job indicated a striking lack of agreement. Maier arrived at this finding by surveying 58 superior-subordinate pairs in 5 large organizations. He explored four areas of the subordinate's job including job duties, job requirements, future changes and obstacles in performing the job. The interviews conducted were analyzed and rated using a five-point scale ranging from almost no agreement on topic (0) to agreement on all or almost all topics (4). The results indicated low agreement ratings for almost all areas (i.e., means ranging from 2.35 to 1.03).

Another study concerning the agreement between foremen and their supervisors' (general foremen) concepts of the foremen's job responsibilities revealed a fairly high level of disagreement, regarding the degree of

responsibility for job functions (Meyer, 1959). In this study, a job responsibility questionnaire (checklist) of 77 job function items, in categories such as planning and scheduling, quality control, training, etc. was administered to formen and general foremen in the General Electric Company. The respondents were asked to describe a particular foreman's position by indicating for each job-function item whether the foreman had "complete", "partial" or "no" responsibility for that function. Of 51 completed sets of questionnaires received, the results indicated complete agreement on 45 out of the 77 job function items (i.e. 58 per cent agreement). Meyer interpreted his results as being indicative of a large amount of disagreement.

Lastly, a study of agreement between worker-supervisor descriptions of the worker's job indicated that generally moderate disagreement was found between supervisors and workers concerning the nature of the worker's job (Hazel, Madden & Christal, 1964). Hazel et al. surveyed 148 pairs of airmen in the Accounting, Finance and Auditing career ladder using a task inventory of 15 major duties that grouped together 479 task statements. Each subject went through the inventory three times: first to check if the task was part of the job; second to rate the

relative amount of time spent on the task; and third to rate the amount of difficulty in performing the task. A 9 point rating scale, ranging from very small amount (1) to very large amount (9), was used to determine time spent and difficulty of performing the task. The results indicated 57% agreement on tasks mutually checked as being part of the job and 48% agreement when relative time spent was considered. The results of the difficulty ratings suggested that the rating scale was not completed as instructed. Hazel concluded generally moderate disagreement (or agreement) between supervisors and workers concerning the nature of the worker's job.

Each of these studies, although methodologically different, have reported a similar conclusion, that is, supervisors and subordinates tend to disagree on what constitutes the subordinate's job. The evidence for this conclusion, however, is not definitive since a fairly limited sample of jobs, job conditions and investigative methodologies have been represented in the research. Also, the issue has been raised by Hazel that the interpretation of supervisor and subordinate agreement may depend on the hypothesis the investigator wishes to test; that is, in terms of the level of agreement he considers sufficient. This issue was

noted in Hazel's study when agreement defined in terms of task performance (57%) was higher than agreement defined in terms of time spent on the tasks (48%). The different nature of jobs and how agreement is defined and measured are problems that need to be investigated further, especially to determine how agreement may vary as a function of the job, job conditions and method of measurement.

In addition to these considerations, in a report by Seigel and Pfeiffer (1964) concerning criterion development, it was stated that before job factors can be employed as criteria for job evaluations, agreement of what the job entails or the job structure, as perceived by personnel at various job levels, must be established. In other words, supervisors' and subordinates' perceived agreement of job factors must be determined in order to employ meaningful job performance evaluation criteria. This notion suggests that if the subordinates' job is perceived in the same manner by both levels (i.e., supervisors and subordinates), increased job satisfaction, harmony between supervisors and subordinates and performance acceptability might be anticipated. It therefore would be important to establish a valid method for optimizing agreement between supervisors and subordinates concerning the subordinates'

job.

This study is another step to further the understanding of how supervisors and subordinates differ in agreement on factors that constitute the subordinates' job. Since the previous research appears sparse and the implications of these findings may have an important impact on job performance evaluations and job satisfaction, it seems desirable to further test the generalizability of the earlier findings. Additionally, the issues of how agreement is defined and measured must be addressed to determine a valid method for assessing the level of agreement or lack of agreement between supervisors and subordinates concerning the subordinates' job. Therefore, the purpose of this study is twofold: 1) to determine if the previous findings are consistent with a general lack of agreement between supervisors and subordinates concerning the subordinates' job, when a different job, job conditions and the use of a different measurement technique is used; and 2) to extend the research of previous studies by exploring a method which uses both supervisors' and subordinates' perceptions of the subordinates' job. To these ends, a novel method was developed to determine agreement in which the following questions were addressed:

1. Is there a difference in agreement between how

- supervisors perceive their subordinates' rating of evaluation factors of the subordinates' job and how the supervisors themselves rate these evaluation factors?
2. Is there a difference in agreement between how supervisors perceive their subordinates' rating of evaluation factors of the subordinates' job and how the subordinates actually rate these evaluation factors?
 3. Is there a difference in agreement between how subordinates perceive their supervisors' rating of evaluation factors of the subordinates' job and how the subordinates themselves rate these evaluation factors?
 4. Is there a difference in agreement between how subordinates perceive their supervisors' rating of evaluation factors of the subordinates' job and how the supervisors actually rate these evaluation factors?
 5. Is there a difference in agreement between how supervisors perceive their subordinates' rating of evaluation factors of the subordinates' job and how the subordinates perceive their supervisors' rating of these

evaluation factors?

6. Is there a difference in agreement between how supervisors actually rate evaluation factors of the subordinates' job and how subordinates actually rate these evaluation factors?

Another way of looking at these questions is illustrated by Figure 1, the Agreement Rating Model.

	Perceived Rating	Actual Rating
Supervisors	Q_1	Q_2
Subordinates	Q_3	Q_4

Figure 1

The Agreement Rating Model:

The first question compares how supervisors perceive their subordinates' rating of evaluation factors of the subordinates' job (Q_1) and how the supervisors themselves actually rate these factors (Q_2). The

second question again compares Q_1 , this time with how subordinates actually rate their evaluation factors (Q_4). The third question compares how the subordinates perceive their supervisors' rating (Q_3) and how the subordinates themselves actually rate these evaluation factors (Q_4). The fourth question compares Q_3 and Q_2 , the subordinates' perceived rating and the supervisors' actual rating. The fifth question compares Q_1 and Q_3 which are the supervisors' perceived and the subordinates' perceived ratings of each other. The sixth question compares Q_2 and Q_4 which are the actual ratings of both supervisors and subordinates, as they perceive them.

Method

Subjects

The subjects were supervisors and subordinates at the Recruit Training Command (RTC) Orlando, Florida. The supervisors consisted of 15 Division Officers (DOs) and Leading Chief Petty Officers (LCPOs) and the subordinates were 35 Company Commanders (CCs), who are responsible for the training of groups of 60 to 80 recruit personnel.

Materials and Apparatus

Four versions of a questionnaire containing ten evaluation factors (e.g. Bearing, Reliability, Adaptability, etc.), with definitions and examples relating the factors to the subordinates' job were constructed (see Appendix 1). The CC job factors used were selected from an evaluation program developed under a previous study (Blaiwes, Weller & Romot, Note 1). Questionnaires one (Q_1) and two (Q_2) were designed to assess the supervisors' perceptions of how their subordinates' rate the importance of these ten evaluation factors and the supervisors' actual perceptions of the importance of these same factors. The other two questionnaires (i.e., Q_3 and Q_4) were designed

for the subordinates. Q₃ was designed to assess the subordinates' perceptions of how their supervisors rate the importance of the ten job factors and Q₄ how they rate the importance of these factors. A six point rating scale, ranging from (1) not at all important to (6) critically important, was provided to the right of each job factor. Although the rating scale and evaluation factors remained the same for each questionnaire, the instructions to elicit responses for each questionnaire differed slightly (See Appendix 2).

Procedure

Two groups were selected for this study. One group was the supervisors which included all available DOs and LCPOs at RTC. The other group was the subordinates, which were a composite of CCs selected on the basis of availability from each of the eight Divisions at RTC. Questionnaires Q₁ and Q₂ were administered to the supervisors and Q₃ and Q₄ were administered to the subordinates. The order of filling out the questionnaire for both groups was reversed in each Division to eliminate any bias due to order of administration. For example, the first Division receiving the questionnaire filled out Q₁ first, Q₂ second, Q₃ first and Q₄ second. The next Division filled out the questionnaires in reverse order, i.e., Q₂, then Q₁ for supervisors and Q₄

and then Q₃ for subordinates. The statement of purpose for the study was read orally to all the participants (see Appendix 2). They were then asked to read the instructions carefully to themselves, sign the consent and fill out the questionnaires. Since the schedule for passing out all the questionnaires covered a span of eight hours in one day, all participants were asked not to discuss the study with any of the other Division personnel until the day had come to a close.

Result

The data were obtained by having the supervisors and subordinates respond to the six-point rating scale which determined the importance of each of the ten evaluation factors of the subordinates' job. The rating scale consisted of the following six points;

1. not at all important
2. slightly important
3. moderately important
4. very important
5. extremely important
6. critically important

Both the supervisors and subordinates were instructed to use this rating scale for their perceived and actual ratings of the ten evaluation factors. For example, supervisors were given questionnaire one (Q_1) and instructed to indicate, by marking an 'x' in the rating scale provided, how they perceived their subordinates would rate the importance of each of the job factors. Then they were given questionnaire two (Q_2) and instructed to rate the importance of each of the job factors as they actually perceived them.

The sample mean ratings of the importance of the ten job evaluation factors, along with the overall

means for each questionnaire (i.e., the ten job evaluation factors combined) were calculated and are listed in Table 1 for each of the four questionnaires.

Table 1

Sample Mean Ratings of the Importance of Subordinate Job Factors for Questionnaires 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Subordinate Job Factors	Supervisors		Subordinates	
	\bar{X}_{Q1}	\bar{X}_{Q2}	\bar{X}_{Q3}	\bar{X}_{Q4}
Bearing	4.867	5.200	5.114	5.286
Reliability	5.267	5.467	5.371	5.200
Adaptability	4.733	4.867	4.943	4.743
Initiative	5.133	5.267	4.971	5.086
Cooperation	4.867	4.733	4.971	4.914
Counseling	5.000	5.267	4.943	5.200
Management	5.000	5.133	5.114	5.086
Problem Solving	4.667	4.867	4.829	4.914
Instruction	5.200	5.200	5.286	5.314
Motivation	5.333	5.467	4.857	5.286
Overall ($\bar{\bar{x}}$)	5.007	5.147	5.040	5.103

In order to determine if there were significant differences in agreement between the supervisors' and subordinates' ratings, t-test analyses were performed.

These statistical analyses were deemed desirable because they were relatively straightforward when compared with a two factor analysis of variance with one repeated measure and unequal N's. The t-tests performed were for independent (i.e., supervisor and subordinate comparisons which included Q1-Q4, Q3-Q2, Q1-Q3 and Q2-Q4) and matched or dependent sample groups (which included supervisor-supervisor and subordinate-subordinate comparisons or Q1-Q2 and Q3-Q4, respectively). The overall means for each of the questionnaires (i.e., \bar{X}_{Q1} , \bar{X}_{Q2} , \bar{X}_{Q3} and \bar{X}_{Q4}) were compared as the primary focus of this analysis.

The agreement model depicting the overall means is shown in Figure 2. Using this model, these means were compared to test the initial hypothesized questions.

	Perceived Rating	Actual Rating
Supervisors	5.007 \bar{X}_{Q1}	5.147 \bar{X}_{Q2}
Subordinates	5.040 \bar{X}_{Q3}	5.103 \bar{X}_{Q4}
Job Factor	Overall Mean	

Figure 2

Agreement Rating of the Overall Means-Questionnaires
1, 2, 3, and 4

The comparisons were as follows:

1. \bar{X}_{Q1} and \bar{X}_{Q2}
2. \bar{X}_{Q1} and \bar{X}_{Q4}
3. \bar{X}_{Q3} and \bar{X}_{Q4}
4. \bar{X}_{Q3} and \bar{X}_{Q2}
5. \bar{X}_{Q1} and \bar{X}_{Q3}
6. \bar{X}_{Q2} and \bar{X}_{Q4}

The computed t-values and indications of significant differences are listed in Table 2 for these six comparisons. As shown, there were no significant differences to report.

Table 2

Overall Mean Comparison of Supervisor-

Subordinate Agreement. N.S. = not significant.

Comparisons	t-value (df)	Significant Differences
1. $\bar{X}_{Q1} - \bar{X}_{Q2}$	-.790 (14)	n.s.
2. $\bar{X}_{Q1} - \bar{X}_{Q4}$	-.577 (48)	n.s.
3. $\bar{X}_{Q3} - \bar{X}_{Q4}$	-.886 (34)	n.s.
4. $\bar{X}_{Q3} - \bar{X}_{Q2}$	-.699 (48)	n.s.
5. $\bar{X}_{Q1} - \bar{X}_{Q3}$	-.202 (48)	n.s.
6. $\bar{X}_{Q2} - \bar{X}_{Q4}$	-.294 (48)	n.s.

Since it was possible that computing the overall means could have averaged out differences that existed for any of the individual job factors, t-tests for each of the ten job factors were performed. The results of

the t-tests performed for each comparison by each job factor have been compiled and are depicted in Table 3. Of the total number of t-tests performed (viz., sixty) there were only two significant differences that were found. These significant differences ($p < .05$) were indicated when certain means of the job factor motivation (i.e., $\bar{X}_{Q2} = 5.467$, $\bar{X}_{Q3} = 4.857$ and $\bar{X}_{Q4} = 5.286$) were compared. The comparisons as indicated in the table were $\bar{X}_{Q3} - \bar{X}_{Q4}$ and $\bar{X}_{Q3} - \bar{X}_{Q2}$. However, this finding could have occurred merely by chance since a large number of t-tests were performed, so no real substantial differences can be reported.

Table 3
Summary of t -values Computed for Each Comparison by Each Job Factor

Comparisons	Bearing	Reliability	Adaptability	Initiative	Cooperation	Counseling	Management	Problem Solving	Instruction	Motivation
1. $\bar{X}Q_1 - \bar{X}Q_2$	-1.784	-1.382	-.619	-.564	+4.487	-1.169	-.619	.612	- .000	-.564
2. $\bar{X}Q_1 - \bar{X}Q_4$	-1.593	+ .302	+ .032	+ .177	-.142	-.799	-.336	.952	-.504	+ .208
3. $\bar{X}Q_3 - \bar{X}Q_4$	-1.291	+1.234	+1.268	-.702	+ .285	-1.426	+ .197	.533	-.226	-2.121*
4. $\bar{X}Q_3 - \bar{X}Q_2$	-.341	-.505	+ .295	1.077	+ .892	-1.232	-.007	.137	+ .343	-2.111*
5. $\bar{X}Q_1 - \bar{X}Q_3$	-.910	-.512	-.775	+ .600	-.388	+ .208	-.472	.603	-.354	+1.698
6. $\bar{X}Q_2 - \bar{X}Q_4$	-.354	+1.296	+ .427	+ .662	-.544	+ .280	+ .182	.177	-.485	+ .756

* $p < .05$ (two-tailed test)

Discussion

The results of this study are not consistent with the previous findings which indicated a general lack of agreement between supervisors and subordinates concerning the subordinates' job. This is evidenced by the fact that there were no substantially significant differences found. However, generally speaking, it would be relatively premature to conclude from this study that a lack of agreement between supervisors and subordinates does not exist. There are a number of possible ways to reconcile the present findings with those of previous research.

One possible explanation for the discrepant findings relates to the setting in which the study took place. As noted by Weller and Blaiwes, 1976, there is a strict regimentation of basic training and a highly structured situation within which the supervisors and subordinates must function at the Recruit Training Command (RTC). This job setting may not allow for much flexibility in performing the subordinates' job because of pre-existing regulations and schedules. Thus, in this case, the job may be more clearly defined for both supervisors and subordinates than in the previous

studies (Maier, 1961; Meyer, 1959) where industrial settings with less structured jobs were used.

Another possible reason for the discrepant findings noted (which is consistent with one finding reported by Hazel, 1964) is that supervisors may show higher agreement with subordinates on a broader or more general work level than on specific work levels. This finding is further substantiated by Meyer's study, where specific items representing the 77 job functions were used and disagreement was found. The present study used job factors that were of a general nature rather than more specific or behavioral in content. Even though the job factors used were defined and examples were given to clearly distinguish each job factor, the respondents were asked primarily to rate the generic factor. The specific examples were only provided for illustrative purpose and were not rated per se.

Other explanations conjectured are that evaluation of CCs by their supervisors, using the same or similar job factors as employed in this study, may have created the degree of agreement noted. In other words, supervisors and subordinates may have been familiar enough with the job factors, from previous evaluation experiences that the importance of these factors may have already been established. Also, it is conceivable

that supervisors' agreement may have been influenced by CCs performing their jobs in a manner congruent with their job factor ratings. The latter line of reasoning implies that the Navy is employing meaningful performance criteria for their CCs at RTC. In addition, it would appear that these criteria are being used successfully to communicate those job factors which are important to the CC's job.

Finally, a reason that must be noted if further studies are to be conducted, is an inherent weakness that may have existed in the data collection method used (i.e., a rating scale). The range of sample mean scores (\bar{X}) were from 4.667 to 5.467 which indicates a limited amount of variability between ratings. It also indicates that very high levels of importance (i.e., very, extremely and critically important) were rated by mostly all participants. This restriction of range and "ceiling effect" may depict rating errors which could have led to the agreement noted. Therefore, before replicating or performing comparative studies, one should consider an alternative data collection method such as a rank-order method which would produce greater variability.

The next major consideration and the primary purpose of this study was to employ an agreement rating

method, which used both supervisors' and subordinates' perceptions of factors concerning the subordinates' job, to define and measure agreement. An agreement rating model (Figure 1) was developed as the basis for examining supervisor-subordinate agreement or lack of agreement. This model allowed for six possible comparisons to be made to determine whether agreement or lack of agreement existed between the supervisors and subordinates. Agreement could be defined in six different ways according to the six hypothesized questions and disagreement would be indicated by noting statistical differences among the groups tested. For example, one of the ways to define agreement was by determining how supervisors rated the importance of a subordinate job factor (e.g., bearing) as compared to how the subordinate rated the same job factor. Disagreement would be indicated by a statistically significant difference between the two ratings and no differences would indicate agreement.

The agreement rating model methodology did allow for statistical comparisons to be made for defining and measuring agreement or lack of agreement. Addressing the issue raised by Hazel, 1964, concerning subjective judgements that are made based upon degrees of agreement, it appears that this model has contributed to further developing potentially more definitive

statements about whether agreement does or does not exist. For example, conjecturing on the two significant differences found, in analyzing the job factor "motivation", it is intuitively appealing to interpret these results as such:

Supervisors have indicated that motivation is an extremely important job factor ($\bar{X}_{Q2} = 5.467$) and they also perceive their subordinates to rate motivation as an extremely important job factor ($\bar{X}_{Q1} = 5.333$). Additionally, when subordinates were asked to rate the importance of motivation, they also agreed that it was extremely important ($\bar{X}_{Q4} = 5.286$). However, when asked to rate how they perceived their supervisors' ratings on motivation, the subordinates indicated that it was not as important ($\bar{X}_{Q3} = 4.857$), as they themselves actually rated the job factor ($\bar{X}_{Q4} = 5.286$). This significant difference ($\underline{p} < .05$) was indicative of a disagreement. Furthermore, this finding was also substantiated when supervisors actual ratings ($\bar{X}_{Q2} = 5.467$) and subordinates' perceived ratings of how they (the supervisors) would rate the importance

of motivation ($\bar{X}_{Q3} = 4.857$) were compared. The results of this comparison were also indicative of a significant difference ($p < .05$) or disagreement.

This example provides an illustration of how more definitive type statements could be made when actual differences or disagreements are evidenced. It should not be misconstrued from this example, however, that these conclusions have been made from the analyses performed. Further investigation to determine whether agreement or lack of agreement exists in the area of motivation would need consideration.

At this point, since agreement can only be assumed from the analyses performed, it seems desirable to determine more conclusively the extent of agreement obtained. Other statistical techniques (e.g. correlations, ANOVA and multiple comparisons) for analyzing the existing data should be considered for further investigation. Also, because the results indicated only findings that were not significant, the question arises - is the agreement rating method sensitive enough to indicate lack of agreement or disagreement when it exists. This question is beyond the present study and needs to be investigated further.

Finally, it should be noted that a t-test analysis

used for multiple comparisons presents a problem, especially when there are a sizeable amount of comparisons to be made. This problem could be overcome by using an alternative analysis, such as the two factor analysis of variance with one repeated measure and unequal N's or multiple comparisons procedures, as mentioned previously, in conjunction with the agreement rating model.

Appendix 1

Job Factors and Rating Scale

CC Job Factors

	NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	MODERATELY IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	CRITICALLY IMPORTANT
1. <u>BEARING</u> - creates a favorable impression in appearance and personal conduct						
• reports for duty in appropriate physical and mental condition						
• wears uniform properly and is neatly groomed						
• conducts himself/herself in a respectful military fashion						
2. <u>RELIABILITY</u> - carries out assigned duties and objectives without undue supervision						
• takes action without letting things slip						
• makes sure his/her training unit is punctual						
• follows orders promptly and efficiently						
3. <u>ADAPTABILITY</u> - smoothly conducts work despite changes in personnel and conditions						
• adapts to new policies and procedures						
• does not become frustrated in demanding situations						
• adjusts to changes in schedules						
4. <u>INITIATIVE</u> - takes actions on his/her own beyond the routine job requirements						
• performs his/her job with enthusiasm						
• gives 100% effort to his/her job						
• takes appropriate action without having to be told or ordered						
5. <u>COOPERATION</u> - works well with others						
• does not resent being told what to do						
• solicits assistance from staff members when needed						
• willingly helps other staff members						

CC Job Factors
(continued)

	NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT	SLIGHTLY IMPORTANT	MODERATELY IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT	CRITICALLY IMPORTANT
6. <u>COUNSELING</u> - helps solve motivational/personal problems of others						
● makes every effort to counsel individual recruits who are having problems						
● directs recruits who are having difficulty toward corrective courses of action						
● deals with recruits informally when appropriate						
7. <u>MANAGEMENT</u> - skillfully deals with available resources						
● makes the best use of his/her time						
● sees to it that all forms, records, reports from his/her training unit are done properly and on time						
● has done an effective job of organizing his/her training unit						
8. <u>PROBLEM SOLVING</u> - finds and implements workable solutions to problems						
● makes efforts to solve problems rather than just grumbling about them						
● does not discourage easily when working on problems						
● recognizes the significance of problems						
9. <u>INSTRUCTION</u> - teaches others basic military skills, naval customs and courtesies						
● gives instructions that are clear and concise						
● gives adequate coverage to instructional areas						
● see that special instruction is given to recruits who need it						
10. <u>MOTIVATION</u> - inspires others toward goal accomplishment						
● looks out for the welfare of his/her recruits						
● is firm in enforcing rules and regulations						
● gives adequate rewards and punishment to recruits in the appropriate situations						

Appendix 2

Purpose and Instructions

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This study is being conducted by Mr. G. E. Romot as one of the requirements for his masters degree from the Industrial Psychology Program at the University of Central Florida. The purpose of this study is to determine how Division Officers (D.O.s) and Leading Chief Petty Officers (LCPOs) view evaluation factors of the Company Commanders' (CCs') job and how CCs' view these evaluation factors. These factors of the CCs' job are not official evaluation items, but may be the same as or similar to factors used in official performance evaluation reports. It should be emphasized that your judgements will be used for research purposes only and will be treated confidentially.

INSTRUCTION - 1

This questionnaire contains a list of ten factors of the CC's job. Each job factor has been defined and examples for each have also been given to further clarify what each factor means. Use the space provided on the right of each of these factors, by placing an "X" in the appropriate block, to indicate how you think your CCs would rate the importance of these job factors for their evaluation. Please consider each factor individually and respond as best and as honestly as you can.

INFORMED CONSENT

I hereby agree to participate in this study and understand that I can terminate my participation at anytime.

Signed: _____

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This study is being conducted by Mr. G. E. Romot as one of the requirements for his masters degree from the Industrial Psychology Program at the University of Central Florida. The purpose of this study is to determine how Division Officers (D.O.s) and Leading Chief Petty Officers (LCPOs) view evaluation factors of the Company Commanders' (CCs') job and how CCs' view these evaluation factors. These factors of the CCs' job are not official evaluation items, but may be the same as or similar to factors used in official performance evaluation reports. It should be emphasized that your judgements will be used for research purposes only and will be treated confidentially.

INSTRUCTION - 2

This questionnaire contains a list of ten factors of the CC's job. Each job factor has been defined and examples for each have also been given to further clarify what each factor means. Use the space provided on the right of each of these factors, by placing an "X" in the appropriate block, to indicate how you would rate the importance of these job factors for the evaluation of your CCs. Please consider each factor individually and respond as best and as honestly as you can.

INFORMED CONSENT

I hereby agree to participate in this study and understand that I can terminate my participation at anytime.

Signed: _____

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This study is being conducted by Mr. G. E. Romot as one of the requirements for his masters degree from the Industrial Psychology Program at the University of Central Florida. The purpose of this study is to determine how Division Officers (D.O.s) and Leading Chief Petty Officers (LCPOs) view evaluation factors of the Company Commanders' (CCs') job and how CCs' view these evaluation factors. These factors of the CCs' job are not official evaluation items, but may be the same as or similar to factors used in official performance evaluation reports. It should be emphasized that your judgements will be used for research purposes only and will be treated confidentially.

INSTRUCTION - 3

This questionnaire contains a list of ten factors of the CC's job. Each job factor has been defined and examples for each have also been given to further clarify what each factor means. Use the space provided on the right of each of these factors by placing an "X" in the appropriate block, to indicate how you think your D.O.s and LCPOs would rate the importance of these job factors for your evaluation. Please consider each factor individually and respond as best and as honestly as you can.

INFORMED CONSENT

I hereby agree to participate in this study and understand that I can terminate my participation at anytime.

Signed: _____

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

This study is being conducted by Mr. G. E. Romot as one of the requirements for his masters degree from the Industrial Psychology Program at the University of Central Florida. The purpose of this study is to determine how Division Officers (D.O.s) and Leading Chief Petty Officers (LCPOs) view evaluation factors of the Company Commanders' (CCs') job and how CCs' view these evaluation factors. These factors of the CCs' job are not official evaluation items, but may be the same as or similar to factors used in official performance evaluation reports. It should be emphasized that your judgements will be used for research purposes only and will be treated confidentially.

INSTRUCTION - 4

This questionnaire contains a list of ten factors of the CC's job. Each job factor has been defined and examples for each have also been given to further clarify what each factor means. Use the space provided on the right of each of these factors, by placing an "X" in the appropriate block, to indicate how you would rate the importance of these job factors for the evaluation of your CCs. Please consider each factor individually and respond as best and as honestly as you can.

INFORMED CONSENT

I hereby agree to participate in this study and understand that I can terminate my participation at anytime.

Signed: _____

Reference Notes

1. Blaiwes, A.S., Weller, D.R., & Romot, G.E. Development and implementation of a computerized evaluation and training system (CETS) at a recruit training command (NAVTRAEQUIPCEN IH-300). Naval Training Equipment Center, Florida: Human Factors Laboratory, March, 1978.

REFERENCES

- Hazel, J.T., Madden, J.M., & Christal, R.E. Agreement between worker supervisor descriptions of the worker's job. Journal of Industrial Psychology, 1964, 2, (3), 71-79.
- Maier, N.R.F. Psychology in industry. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965, 255-257.
- Meyer, H.F. A comparison of foreman and general foreman conceptions of the foreman's job responsibilities. Personnel Psychology, 1959, 12, 445-452.
- Siegel, A.I., & Pfeffer, M.F. Factorial congruence in criterion development. Personnel Psychology, 1965, 18, 267-279.
- Weller, D.S., & Blaiwes, A.S. Leadership dimensions of Navy recruit company commanders and recruit morale and performance. Psychological Reports, 1976, 39 767-770.